IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

(Special Original Jurisdiction)

THURSDAY, THE TWENTY THIRD DAY OF SEPTEMBER
TWO THOUSAND AND FOUR

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE SMT JUSTICE T.MEENA KUMARI

WRIT PETITION NO : 8591 of 1995

Between:

T. Rajesham, S/o. Veeraiah,
Resident of Siddipet, Medak District

..... PETITIONER

AND

1 The Mandal Revenue Officer,
Siddipet, Medak District.
2 The Revenue Divisional Officer,
Siddipet, Medak District.
3 The Commissioner,
Siddipet Municipality, Siddipet,
Medak District.

.....RESPONDENTS

Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed herein the High Court may be pleased to issue an appropriate writ, order or direction, more particularly one in the nature of writ of Mandamus forbearing the respondents from interfering with the structures made by the petitioner of an extent of land 666 Sq.Yards with the compound wall, situated at Door No. 12-3-18, Mangamma Thota, Nasarpura, Siddipet, Medak Dt. by declaring the action of the respondents as illegal and void.

Counsel for the Petitioner: MR.T.SUBRAMANYAM

Counsel for the Respondent Nos.1 to 3: GP FOR REVENUE

The Court made the following :

ORDER:

This writ petition is filed seeking a Writ of Mandamus restraining the respondents herein from interfering with the structures made by him in an extent of 666 square yards of land situated at Door No.12-3-18,Mangamma Thota, Nasarpura, Siddipet.

The facts leading to filing of this writ petition, in brief, are that the petitioner is the owner of the land in an extent of 666 square yards situated at Door No.12-3-18, Mangamma Thota, Nazarpura, Siddipet and he constructed the compound wall surrounding his property. He has been in possession and enjoyment of the same since 30 years by paying taxes to the Municipality. Due to the political rivalries, the 1st respondent is trying to demolish the structures in the said premises. In similar circumstances, the 1st respondent at Lingareddipally village demolished the structures without issuing any prior notice to the owners concerned. Apprehending the same situation, he made representation to the 1st and 2nd respondents, but they did not issue any notice calling for his explanation. As the petitioner has no alternate remedy except invoking the jurisdiction of this court, he filed the present writ petition.

Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, without going into the merits of the case, it would suffice in the interest of justice, if a direction is issued to

the respondents to dispose of the representation made by the petitioner, as expeditiously as possible, in accordance with law, if not already disposed of.

The writ petition is accordingly disposed of. No costs.

_____

23-09-2004

rkk

To

1 The Mandal Revenue Officer,

Siddipet, Medak District.

2 The Revenue Divisional Officer,
Siddipet, Medak District.

3 The Commissioner,
Siddipet Municipality, Siddipet,
Medak District.

4 Two CCs to GP for Revenue, High Court

buildings,Hyderabad(OUT)

5 Two CD copies